

Best Available Copy**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed May 17, 2006. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and pending claims are respectfully requested.

I. Drawings Objection

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the drawings are objected to for not showing memory of a printing device. In response to the objection, Applicant has amended claim 10 to remove the term "memory." In view of that amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings are acceptable and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

II. Claim Objections

Claims 10, 13, and 19 have been objected to for various informalities. Each of these claims has been amended through this Response to remove such informalities. In view of those claim amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are not objectionable and requests that the objections be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-16, and 18-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Patton, et al.* ("Patton," U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0140017). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Best Available Copy

As indicated above, each of Applicant's remaining independent claims has been amended through this Response. In view of those amendments, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections are moot as having been drawn against the claims in a previous form. Applicant therefore requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Turning to the merits of Applicant's claims, as amended, Applicant contends that none of the cited prior art references teach or suggest downloading content from a color adjustment web service to a user web browser, the content including "generic access instructions" and accessing imaging data to be printed "using an imaging extension that forms part of the user web browser, the imaging extension being called upon by the generic access instructions to access the imaging data". For at least that reason, Applicant's remaining claims are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.

IV Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8, 17, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Patton* in view of *Chan* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,342,952), and claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Patton* in view of *Kakigi, et al.* ("Kakigi," U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0054350).

As is identified above, Patton does not teach aspects of Applicant's claims. In that neither Chan nor Kakigi remedies the deficiencies of the Patton reference, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8, 10, 17, and 23 are allowable over the Patton/Chan and Patton/Kakigi for at least the same that Applicant's other claims are allowable over Patton.

V. Canceled Claims

Claims 2-7, 12-17, and 19-22 and have been canceled from the application without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to present these canceled claims, or variants thereof, in continuing applications to be filed subsequently.

VI. New Claims


Claims 24-27 have been added into the application through this Response. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims describe an invention novel and unobvious in view of the prior art of record and, therefore, respectfully requests that these claims be held to be allowable.

Best Available Copy

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,


David R. Risley
Registration No. 39,345

Best Available Copy